

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 24-32 are active in the case.

Claims 24-26 are amended to correct an obvious typographical error in that "and" is deleted and "to" is added between X¹ and X⁴. Basis for this change may be found on page 6, general formula [4] of the specification. Claims 30-32 have been added to preferred embodiments. Basis for these claims may be found on page 6, general formula [4] and Example 34 of the specification. No new matter has been added into the amended claims or new claims.

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended to comply with the Examiner's objections and M.P.E.P. §608.01(b).

Formula (41) on page 42 of the specification has been amended to delete one of the four bonds to one of the nitrogens. The specification is now in proper form.

The rejection of Claims 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over JP 10-251633 or U.S. 6,280,859B1 is traversed.

Accompanying the response is a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 demonstrating the superiority of a material for an organic electruminescence device containing the constituent chrysene of the present claims, as compared to materials for organic electroluminescent devices of the references containing pyrene and anthracene constituents, respectively, for emitted light superior in blueness and excellent in color purity. This is demonstrated in the table in the Declaration, which clearly shows that the compounds of the present claims having a chrysene nucleus (A) and (A') give a smaller CIE (y) value, which indicates a stronger blueness and a higher color purity, as compared to the compounds of the prior art references having a pyrene nucleus (B) and (B') for an anthracene nucleus (C) and (C'). Additionally, Example 34 of the present specification supports the showing in the

Application No. 10/814,121
Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2004

Declaration that compounds, for example, compound 36 of Example 34, according to general formula [4] on page 6 of the specification, clearly exhibit blue-light emission, which is high in luminance and excellent in color purity. As can be seen in Table 1 in the Declaration CIE (y) values for (A) and (A') are much lower than the corresponding compounds (B) and (B') and (C) and (C') of the prior art, having corresponding substitution groups. Therefore, it is submitted that the Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 shows superior results for an organic electroluminescence device containing the material of the present claims, as compared to an organic electroluminescence devices containing materials of the prior art references.

It is submitted that Claims 24-32 are allowable and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
REM/rac



Roland E. Martin
Registration No.: 48,082